

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 06 2007

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 22 are presently pending in the application. As it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 - 5, 7 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,532,427 to Stoyko ("STOYKO").

On page 4 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over STOYKO in view of U. S. Patent No. 3,885,084 to Kaiserwerth et al ("KAISERWERTH"). Additionally on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 8 - 18 and 20 - 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over STOYKO in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,194,653 to McMiller et al ("MCMILLER").

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

More particularly, Applicants' independent claims 1 and 19 recite, among other limitations:

Applic. No. 10/616,113
Response Dated April 6, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of December 6, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 06 2007

at least first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition,
[emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, Applicants' claims all require, among other things, first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition.

However, the **STOYKO** reference, cited against both of Applicants' independent claims, neither teaches, nor suggests, among other limitations of Applicants' claims, first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition. More particularly, **STOYKO** discloses bends in a single formed sheet, which bends are compressed together to form an electrically conductive joint which is neither detachable at a transition, nor made of a first and second housing part, as required by Applicants' claims. See, for example, col. 1 of **STOYKO**, lines 49 - 62 state:

Therefore it is an object of the invention to provide an electrically conductive joint of a sheet of conductive material coated on one surface thereof with an electrically insulating material merely by properly bending the composite sheet material. This is done by providing one end of the sheet with an off-set portion and then bending an end part of the off-set portion into the form of a first depending leg with the insulating material on the outside of the leg. The other end of the sheet is bent into the form of a second depending leg with the insulating material on the inside of the leg. The two depending legs then are juxtaposed and the two ends compressed into the form of a joint wherein electrically conductive surfaces are in face-to-face contact, providing continuity of

Applic. No. 10/616,113
Response Dated April 6, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of December 6, 2006

electrical conductivity. [emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, contrary to Applicants' claimed invention, **STOYKO** discloses an electrically conductive joint and a method for forming a hollow housing out of a **single sheet** of steel plated metal. A magnetic shielding for electrical components should be achieved by that housing. The housing disclosed by **STOYKO** is made out of one steel plate, wherein the end parts of the
~~single steel plate are bent and compressed together~~ into the form of a joint wherein electrically conductive surfaces are in face-to-face contact providing continuity of electrical conductivity. This can additionally be seen from col. 2 of **STOYKO**, lines 40 - 44, which state:

In FIG. 6, a hollow housing denoted generally by the numeral 14 is formed with ends 1 and 9 of the sheet material connected with a formed joint 16, as above-described. Such a housing is useful for surrounding and magnetically shielding an electrical apparatus.
[emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, contrary to Applicants' claimed invention which recites at least first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition, the **STOYKO** reference discloses a single sheet of metal wherein bends formed in the ends 1 and 9 of the single sheet are collapsed and compressed to form a joint. Thus, the ends 1 and 9 of the single sheet of material of **STOYKO**, are not first and second housing portions, as alleged on page 2 of the Office Action, nor are

Applic. No. 10/616,113
Response Dated April 6, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of December 6, 2006

the bent "ends" 1 and 9 of **STOYKO** detachably connected to one another at a transition, as required by Applicants' claims.

The **MCMILLER** and **KAISERWERTH** references, cited in the Office Action in combination with **STOYKO** against certain of Applicants' dependent claims, do not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of **STOYKO**. As such, Applicants' claims are believed to be patentable over **STOYKO**, **MCMILLER** and ~~**KAISERWERTH**, whether taken alone, or in combination.~~

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 19. Claims 1 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 19.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 22 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in

Applic. No. 10/616,113
Response Dated April 6, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of December 6, 2006

better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one (1) month extension of time, to and including, April 6, 2007 to respond to the present Office Action.

~~The extension fee for response within a period of one (1)~~
month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

Kerry P. Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237

April 6, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101